

MINUTES OF THE CITY OF SUNSET HILLS

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 4, 2016

The Sunset Hills Public Works Committee met Thursday, February 4, 2016 at 6:00 P.M. in the Public Works Conference Room located at 3939 S. Lindbergh Blvd. The following were present:

Chairman Musich opened the meeting at 6:00pm.

Attendees:

**Roll Call.**

**Present:** Pat Fribis, Tom Musich, Kurt Krueger, Rich Gau.  
Bryson Baker – City Engineer/Director of Public Works  
Wes Searcy – Assistant City Engineer

Also in attendance were:

Alderman Steve Bersche  
Stephen Hayes – 12986 Weber Hill  
Roger Kaiser – 12337 Courtyard Lake Dr.  
Casey Wong – 10246 E. Watson  
Frank Hardy – 421 Rayburn  
Mr. & Mrs. Anatt Pattichot – 13336 W. Watson  
Ryan Daniels – 13344 W. Watson  
Gloria Lloyd – The Call Newspaper

1. Approval of Minutes from January 7, 2016

Alderman Fribis had a correction on Page 3, the third paragraph under item 7 the word “looks” should be changed to “look.” The committee approved the minutes for January as amended.

**Motion:** To approve the Minutes of the January 7, 2016 Public Works Committee.,

**Action:** Approve,

**Moved by** Kurt Krueger, **Seconded by** Pat Fribis.

Motion passed unanimously.

2. Citizen Comments

Alderman Bersche said he was here with regard to MSD work in the Richview area.

Stephen Hayes wanted to express his thanks to the Public Works Department and monitor the Flood Update discussion tonight.

Roger Kaiser said he was here to monitor the discussion for sidewalks.

Casey Wong said he wanted information regarding the public input meeting for the East Watson Sidewalk Project. Chairman Musich indicated it was planned for March 17<sup>th</sup> and asked Mr. Wong to spread the word. Mr. Baker indicated the meeting would take place in the meeting room of the Community Center.

Mr. Hardy indicated he was present to observe the meeting.

Mr. and Mrs. Anatt Pattichot indicated that they were here with regard to flood relief effort update tonight.

3. Sanitary Sewer Lateral Assistance Program

Mr. Baker explained the details as he and Attorney Jones understood the contract language with regard to exclusivity. Discussion led to the fact that there was a first reading by the Board and the duration of the contract might be the only condition that needs further consideration before a vote.

4. Private Streets – Discussion Regarding Acceptance Procedure

Chairman Musich presented the committee with a proposal of a Bill for consideration by the Board of Aldermen on this subject. The Committee read through the document as the changes from the Bill as distributed in the Committee packets were not easy to describe.

Chairman Musich went over specific changes in paragraphs A, B, D, and E for the document distributed by Attorney Jones to the Committee earlier this day.

Alderman Fribis suggested a change to paragraph F with regard to the cost borne by the applicant(s). The Committee read this section and discussed possible clarifications to the language there within.

Alderman Gau asked about the condition in paragraph E relative to public access. Alderman Krueger commented that he interpreted that section as covering the likelihood of a gated community. Mr. Searcy brought up the example where Sunset Chase had a rejection condition because it did not connect direct to the public right of way. Mr. Gau asked that this section be written with more specificity for these conditions.

Alderman Gau asked about Section F and the grade of streets relative to compliance with City Code. He expressed concern over the variance process in such determinations. Chairman Musich said he felt comfortable with Attorney Jones' interpretation of the variance process. Discussion led to the suggestion of an edit to Section F relative to the timely construction of items defined in paragraph C.

Alderman Krueger suggested that there might be a change to paragraph G in its relation to the items contained in paragraph C. Chairman Musich asked for a specific edit.

The Committee had about 45 minutes of discussion with specific edits to the suggested Bill for consideration. In deference to those in attendance for other topics, members expressed concern over moving too fast on this matter and took the following action:

**Motion:** To continue this item for discussion at the next Public Works Committee Meeting.,

**Action:** Approve,

**Moved by** Rich Gau, **Seconded by** Pat Fribis.

**Vote:** Motion passed (**summary:** Yes = 3, No = 1, Abstain = 0).

**Yes:** Kurt Krueger, Pat Fribis, Rich Gau.

**No:** Tom Musich.

Mr. Baker asked Chairman Musich if item 7 regarding the Flood Update could be covered next. Chairman Musich allowed this discussion to take place now.

#### 7. Flood Information - Update

Mr. Baker explained that the City is essentially in the same place for the past couple of weeks. He explained that Alderman Baebler asked that an e-mail be prepared explaining what we know at this time. He said that information was distributed by Alderman Baebler to the residents earlier in the day. Mr. Baker explained that the area was declared a disaster and now there will be a 12 month period where applications will be due to FEMA. He said the SEMA will require those ahead of time to review and choose the most legitimate cases that have the best chance of receiving Federal funding for their submission to FEMA. Mr. Baker said that we expect SEMA to be in contact with the City requesting our submission of a "Notice of Interest"(NOI) with regard to requests for buyout. He said he has an appointment to meet with 2 of the impacted families to discuss and gather details and necessary documentation for their cases. Mr. Baker detailed that the information to be gathered includes damage from this flood, plus any prior claims for flood-related damages, valuation of the property, and other specific details. He said he was coming to the Committee to ask that if we do submit, reminding all in attendance that the likelihood of receiving these funds are "very slim," because there are some many people wanting help from this limited resource. Mr. Baker said that we want to apply to let them know we are interested and we will do our best to secure any funding for our residents that might be possible, assuming concurrence by the Public Works Committee and the general Board of Aldermen. He said that this is the HMGP Program and is a 75% with a 25% local match grant. Mr. Baker said that the local match could be partially or totally the City's responsibility or the County could also participate. He said the City would need to be prepared to pay this local portion and that it is similar to our 80/20 match we apply for toward roadwork when we receive funding for those projects, where the City pays the 20% up front. Mr. Baker said he wants to make sure the City is in agreement with this in accordance with any possible obligation of City funds. He said the City would give this serious consideration depending on the size of the costs.

Alderman Fribis asked about the total of the upfront costs. Mr. Baker responded this is not known yet, but that we are working on trying to ascertain same.

Mr. Gau asked if the process obligates the City toward the upfront costs. Mr. Baker responded that first the homeowner has to want the funding and by the City submitting for it, we are saying we are willing to commit to the upfront cost.

Mr. Krueger asked if this would be voted upon at the next meeting. Mr. Baker said he was looking for a decision from the Board as to if we are in favor of submitting the NOI. Mr. Krueger asked

if this was again the meeting this coming Tuesday. Mr. Baker responded that it did not have to happen this Tuesday. He said he has not been notified yet. Mr. Krueger stated that for his vote, he would need to know where our financial risk is within a certain range. He added that this was a matter that should gather input from the Finance Committee as to where we would come up with those monies. Mr. Krueger asked if we would know the amount or range by this Tuesday. Mr. Baker said we should probably put together the information for the NOI to the Board so these questions are detailed for a decision.

Alderman Gau suggested that we could submit this as the Public Works part of the NOI. He agreed that this was a matter for the Finance Committee's consideration and input.

Chairman Musich expressed concern over how wide the range of City liability could be on this matter.

Discussion led to the determination that this subject would best be handled by the Finance Committee for their recommendation to the general Board of Aldermen.

Alderman Fribis asked if the buy-out process moves forward if the City then takes on the responsibility to remove the structures and then the maintenance of these properties for perpetuity. Chairman Musich responded affirmatively.

Mr. Baker asked if the residents in attendance had any questions.

Mr. Hayes asked Alderman Fribis for the date of the Finance Committee meeting. Alderman Fribis responded that it would be February 22<sup>nd</sup>, at 5:30pm in this Board room.

Mr. Hayes asked if the final assessment on this decision would rest with the Board of Aldermen. Mr. Baker responded that the matter will be referred to the Finance Committee for their recommendation to the general Board of Aldermen.

Mr. Hayes asked if this decision could take until December with the FEMA/SEMA parts in this process. Mr. Baker responded affirmatively and it could take longer.

Alderman Fribis said that this is a long time for these residents to have to endure this process. Mr. Hayes said his mortgage company is allowing him an abeyance of having to pay on his mortgage for 3 months. He said that they are looking for more information once he has it to provide them.

Alderman Fribis said she noted Mr. Hayes removed the debris from the property. Mr. Hayes responded affirmatively and complimented the help of the Public Works Department.

Mr. Gau asked if there was more debris removal City-wide. Mr. Baker responded there is still some material along Old Gravois.

Mr. Daniels asked if the other flood mitigation program will apply. Mr. Baker responded negatively, that we will not have that information until SEMA responds. Mr. Daniels said that was what he interpreted from today's e-mail he received. Mr. Baker detailed some of the other programs mentioned in the e-mail. Mr. Daniels asked if any of the affected families have applied for assistance under those programs and if there was a shorter time frame for response on them. Mr. Hayes asked if others like the Straub's who've incurred repetitive loss might be applicable under the repeat loss program. Mr. Baker responded that the City did not know the details of who has applied or what some folks might meet certain criteria for specific programs. He said applications are due in April for the

repetitive and severe loss programs. Mr. Baker said he hopes to meet with the impacted families within the next couple of weeks.

Ms. Pattichot asked that if the City responds “no” to the assistance, what would be the factors affecting that decision and if they were mostly financial. Mr. Baker responded that he really could not say, but financial consideration could obviously be a part of a decision of what is best for the entire City. He said that we really do not have much information at this point.

5. Duct Cleaning

Discussion led to the direction that this item would not require mitigation via a cleaning process.

6. Permission to purchase budgeted equipment:

- Side shift (boom) mower - \$93,562.01
- One ton double cab pick-up - \$44,928.00
- Dump truck - \$68,631.00
- Tar melter - \$37,417.12

**Motion:** To recommend approval of the mower and tar melter with a deference of the other 2 items pending further discussion regarding a possible buy-out of the flooded homes by the Finance Committee,

**Action:** Approve,

**Moved by** Rich Gau, **Seconded by** Pat Fribis.

Motion passed unanimously.

8. Project Updates:

- West Watson – Mr. Baker detailed that he has all the properties acquired and files assembled. This will go to MODOT with plans simultaneously tomorrow. He added that we expect to be able to move forward in the next couple of months with the solicitation and bidding process.
- Eddie and Park Sidewalk – Mr. Baker said that Mr. Searcy will be working with Oates to advertise this in the next month or two. He stated the start date will not be until school is out.
- East Watson Sidewalk – Mr. Baker explained that we have a scheduled public meeting at the Community Center on March 17<sup>th</sup> at 6pm in the Community Center. Chairman Musich asked for publication of that meeting. Ms. Lloyd said that can be done and Mr. Baker said the department will also solicit in the newspapers.
- Lindbergh Sidewalks – Mr. Baker stated that we have the agreements approved for this project and now we are working with 3 consultants for selection of one of them.

Chairman Musich asked if Mr. Kaiser had a question. Mr. Kaiser asked for a definition of the Eddie & Park sidewalk project. Mr. Musch responded that it was from Robyn to the Dog Park.

9. Other Matters Deemed Appropriate

Alderman Fribis asked about political sign policy stating that staff advised that they would not be enforcing the sign ordinance. Mr. Baker responded that he would cover this concern with staff, but that signs are not allowed in rights of way. He said the comment may have come from the perspective that we do not enjoy involving ourselves with competing candidate arguments, but that we would enforce the requirement to keep signs out of the rights of way. Mr. Searcy detailed how the department determines rights of way (12') for concrete streets and (8') for asphalt streets.

**Motion:** To adjourn,

**Action:** Adjourn,

**Moved by** Kurt Krueger, **Seconded by** Pat Fribis.

Motion passed unanimously.

The Meeting adjourned at 7:34pm

Respectfully,

---

Bryson E. Baker, PE  
City Engineer / Director of Public Works